

EXHIBIT J

1 Kathleen Sullivan (SBN 242261)
kathleensullivan@quinnmanuel.com
2 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN LLP
3 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10010
4 Telephone: (212) 849-7000
Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

Steven Cherny (admitted *pro hac vice*)
steven.cherny@kirkland.com
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
601 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10022
Telephone: (212) 446-4800
Facsimile: (212) 446-4900

6 Sean S. Pak (SBN 219032)
seanpak@quinnmanuel.com
7 John M. Neukom (SBN 275887)
johnneukom@quinnmanuel.com.
8 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN LLP
9 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 875-6600
10 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

Adam R. Alper (SBN 196834)
adam.alper@kirkland.com
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
555 California Street
San Francisco, California 94104
Telephone: (415) 439-1400
Facsimile: (415) 439-1500

11 Mark Tung (SBN 245782)
marktung@quinnemanuel.com
12 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN LLP
13 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
14 Telephone: (650) 801-5000
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

Michael W. De Vries (SBN 211001)
michael.devries@kirkland.com
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
333 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 680-8400
Facsimile: (213) 680-8500

16 | Attorneys for Plaintiff Cisco Systems, Inc.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

19 | CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.) CASE NO. 5:14-cv-05344-BLF

20 Plaintiff,

CASE NO. 5:14-cv-05344-BLF

21 || v.

**PLAINTIFF CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.'S
FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL
OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO
DEFENDANT ARISTA NETWORKS,
INC.'S FIRST SET OF
INTERROGATORIES (NO. 15)**

22 | ARISTA NETWORKS, INC.

Defendant

24

**INC.'S FIRST SET OF
INTERROGATORIES (NO. 15)**

1 Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff Cisco
 2 Systems, Inc. (“Cisco”), by counsel, hereby provides its objections and responses to Defendant
 3 Arista Networks, Inc.’s (“Arista’s”) First Set of Interrogatories, which were served on Cisco on
 4 April 10, 2015 (the “Interrogatories”).

5 **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

6 Cisco makes the following general objections to Arista’s Interrogatories, which apply to
 7 each interrogatory regardless of whether the general objections are specifically incorporated into
 8 the specific objections and responses below.

9 1. Cisco is responding to each interrogatory as it interprets and understands each
 10 interrogatory with respect to the issues in this Litigation. If Arista asserts a different interpretation
 11 of any interrogatory, Cisco reserves the right to supplement or amend its responses or objections.

12 2. Cisco objects to each interrogatory to the extent it is inconsistent with or seeks to
 13 impose obligations beyond those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Civil and
 14 Patent Local Rules of the Northern District of California, and any orders governing this Litigation.

15 3. Cisco objects to the definitions of “Cisco,” “You,” and “Your,” to the extent that
 16 the definitions are overly broad and purport to require Cisco to provide information that is not
 17 within the possession, custody, or control of Cisco.

18 4. Cisco objects to Arista’s definition of “Asserted Patents” and “Asserted Claim” to
 19 the extent that Arista’s use of those terms in its interrogatories to Cisco renders certain of Arista’s
 20 Interrogatories as constituting multiple discrete subparts that are in fact multiple, separate
 21 interrogatories.

22 5. Cisco objects to the definitions of “CLI Command” and “Network Management
 23 Product” to the extent that these terms are vague and ambiguous with respect to their scope and
 24 application as used by Arista, rendering these terms at least potentially unclear with respect to
 25 what particular devices are intended to be incorporated thereby, and further on the grounds that
 26 use of the terms in Arista’s Interrogatories renders those interrogatories overbroad and unduly
 27 burdensome to the extent that the discovery sought by such interrogatories is not reasonably tied to
 28 Cisco’s claims or Arista’s defenses in this Litigation. Cisco further objects to the use of these

1 terms in Arista's Interrogatories to the extent that such interrogatories are not reasonably
 2 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

3 6. Cisco objects to the definition of "Relating to" as vague and ambiguous and overly
 4 broad, unduly burdensome, and further to the extent that interrogatories using such terms are not
 5 reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

6 7. Cisco objects to the definition of "Identify" and the instructions set out in
 7 Paragraphs 10–12 as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and further to the extent that
 8 interrogatories using such terms are not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of
 9 admissible evidence. Cisco further objects to these definitions and instructions to the extent that
 10 the burden of deriving or ascertaining the requested information is substantially the same for
 11 Arista as it is for Cisco.

12 8. Cisco objects to each and every interrogatory as overly broad, unduly burdensome,
 13 cumulative, and duplicative to the extent it seeks identification of "any," "each," or "all"
 14 documents of a specified type or nature, when a subset of such documents will provide the
 15 requested information. Cisco objects generally to each and every interrogatory as overly broad,
 16 vague and ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible
 17 evidence, to the extent that it seeks information regarding "any," "each," or "all" persons, entities,
 18 objects, or events.

19 9. Cisco objects to the "Definitions" and "Instructions" of the Interrogatories to the
 20 extent they alter the plain meaning of any specific interrogatory and render the interrogatory
 21 vague, ambiguous, and overbroad.

22 10. Cisco objects to each interrogatory to the extent that it is unlimited in temporal
 23 and/or geographic scope, or to the extent it would require Cisco to provide information or
 24 documents in violation of an applicable foreign law or regulation.

25 11. Cisco objects to each interrogatory to the extent that it is overbroad, unduly
 26 burdensome, and/or calls for provision of information or documents that are neither relevant to
 27 any claim or defense in this litigation nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible
 28 evidence.

1 12. Cisco objects to each interrogatory to the extent that it calls for production of
 2 information or documents that are not within the possession, custody, or control of Cisco, or to the
 3 extent the interrogatory seeks information that may not be disclosed pursuant to a protective order
 4 or non-disclosure agreement, or calls for Cisco to prepare documents and/or things that do not
 5 already exist.

6 13. Cisco objects to each interrogatory to the extent that it calls for production of
 7 information or documents that are publicly available or equally available to Arista, and therefore
 8 are of no greater burden for Arista to obtain than for Cisco to obtain.

9 14. Cisco objects to each interrogatory as overbroad and unduly burdensome to the
 10 extent that it is not limited to a time frame relevant to this Litigation or seeks information or
 11 documents not within the applicable scope of this Litigation.

12 15. Cisco objects to each interrogatory to the extent it seeks information or documents
 13 that Cisco is not permitted to disclose pursuant to confidentiality obligations to third parties or
 14 court order. Cisco will provide such responsive, relevant, and non-privileged information and/or
 15 produce documents in accordance with the Protective Order governing this Litigation and after
 16 complying with its obligations to the third party and/or court.

17 16. Cisco objects to each interrogatory to the extent it seeks information, documents,
 18 and/or things protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine,
 19 common-interest privilege, and/or any other applicable privilege, immunity, doctrine, or
 20 protection, including without limitation in connection with the common interest doctrine
 21 (collectively, as used herein, “privileged”). Nothing contained in these objections and responses
 22 should be considered a waiver of any attorney-client privilege, work-product protection, or any
 23 other applicable privilege or doctrine, including in connection with the common interest doctrine.
 24 Cisco does not intend to provide information or produce documents that would divulge any
 25 privileged information. Any such disclosure is inadvertent and shall not be deemed a waiver of
 26 any applicable privilege or immunity.

27 17. Cisco objects to Arista’s Interrogatories to the extent that their subparts exceed the
 28 number of interrogatories permitted under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including Rule

1 33(a)(1), the Civil and Patent Local Rules of the Northern District of California, and any orders
2 governing this Litigation.

3 18. Cisco objects to each interrogatory to the extent that it is vague, ambiguous, or
4 confusing due to Arista's failure to define terms or failure to describe the information or
5 documents sought with reasonable particularity.

6 19. Cisco objects to the factual characterizations of Arista's Interrogatories. By
7 responding, Cisco does not accept or admit any of Arista's factual characterizations.

8 20. Terms or phrases with specific legal significance appear in many of Arista's
9 Interrogatories. Neither Cisco's objections and responses, nor the provision of information or
10 production of documents in response to any interrogatory, are an admission or indication that such
11 information and documents are relevant to any legal theory, or that any of the legal terms used
12 have any applicability in their legal sense to any information or documents produced by Cisco in
13 response to the Interrogatories.

14 21. Cisco objects to these Interrogatories on relevance and burden grounds to the extent
15 they are not limited in temporal scope, or to the extent that time period specified encompasses
16 time periods not relevant to this Litigation, or to the extent the requests are not limited in
17 geographic scope.

18 22. Cisco objects to the Interrogatories as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the
19 extent they call for the provision of information or production of documents of technical
20 information, or otherwise, including source code, in connection with Cisco's products, where such
21 information or documents are either duplicative of other documents or information that will be
22 produced and/or are not relevant to this Litigation and Cisco's products relevant to this Litigation.
23 Cisco further objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that they call for the provision of
24 information or production of documents of technical information, or otherwise, including source
25 code, in connection with Cisco's products, where such information and documents are not
26 necessary to understand the relevant structure, function, and operation of Cisco's products relevant
27 to this Litigation.

28

1 23. Cisco objects to each interrogatory as premature to the extent it calls for documents
2 or information that is the subject of later disclosure deadlines in this Litigation and/or expert
3 reports and testimony, including as set forth in Rule 26(a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil
4 Procedure, the Patent Local Rules of the Northern District of California, and the Case
5 Management Order to be entered in this Litigation.

6 24. Any Cisco response that it will provide information or produce documents should
7 not be construed to mean that responsive information or documents in fact exist; only that, if such
8 relevant, non-privileged, non-objectionable information or documents exist, are in Cisco's
9 possession, custody, or control, and are located after a reasonable search of the location or
10 locations where responsive information or documents are likely to be located, such information or
11 documents will be produced in a timely manner.

12 25. Cisco further reserves all rights to supplement its responses to Arista's
13 Interrogatories in compliance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including under Rule
14 26(e), as well as the Civil and Patent Local Rules of the Northern District of California and any
15 orders governing this Litigation, and as Cisco's investigation and discovery proceeds in this
16 Litigation.

RESPONSES TO INTERROGATORIES

19 | **INTERROGATORY NO. 15:**

20 If You seek to recover lost profits by way of any claim in this matter, identify with
21 specificity all bases on which You seek such recovery, including but not limited to identifying any
22 and all facts, witnesses, evidence, communications and documents that You believe support Your
23 claim for such recovery.

25 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 15:**

26 Cisco incorporates by reference its General Objections as though fully set forth herein.
27 Cisco also objects to this interrogatory as undefined, vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and unduly
28 burdensome in its use of the terms “with specificity,” “all bases.” Cisco further objects to this

1 request as compound and containing multiple subparts. Cisco further objects to this interrogatory
 2 to the extent that it calls for information that is in Arista's control, but which Arista has not yet
 3 produced. Cisco further objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it prematurely seeks
 4 expert testimony. Cisco further objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it prematurely
 5 seeks validity positions before Arista has produced any evidence that the asserted patents are
 6 invalid. Cisco further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks information that is
 7 protected by the attorney-client privilege, that constitutes attorney work-product, or that is
 8 protected by any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity, including without limitation
 9 in connection with the common interest doctrine.

10 Subject to and without waiver of its general and specific objections, Cisco incorporates by
 11 reference, as if fully set forth herein, Cisco's Initial Disclosures pursuant to Rule 26(a)(1) and its
 12 response to Interrogatory No. 1. Cisco further responds, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(d), that
 13 Cisco will produce documents containing information responsive to this interrogatory, which
 14 information may be obtained from the documents by Arista as easily as by Cisco. Cisco's
 15 discovery efforts in this case are ongoing, and Cisco reserves the right to further supplement this
 16 response in light of facts learned during discovery, including information regarding Arista's
 17 accused products.

18

19 **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 0:**

20 Subject to and without waiver of its general and specific objections, Cisco further responds
 21 as follows:

22 Arista has admitted in numerous public statements that it competes with Cisco. (*See, e.g.*,
 23 CSI-CLI-0035237; Arista presentation entitled "Our Journey to Software Driven Cloud
 24 Networking," *available at* http://investors.arista.com/files/doc_presentations/Pres/Arista-BarclaysPres-120914-FINAL-USETHISv2_v001_a8p3ci.pdf, p. 5; "Arista Networks Inc at
 25 Bernstein Technology Innovation Summit – Final," *available at*
 26 <http://www.crmz.com/NewsStory.aspx?NewsId=14139822>; and Arista Networks, Inc. 2014
 27 Annual Report, *available at* http://investors.arista.com/files/doc_financials/Arista-2014-Annual-

1 [Report_v001_d7suv1.pdf](#), p. 16.) Arista has admitted that Cisco is its primary competitor, which
 2 is a sentiment echoed by industry observers. (See Arista Networks, Inc. 2014 Annual Report,
 3 available at http://investors.arista.com/files/doc_financials/Arista-2014-Annual-Report_v001_d7suv1.pdf, p. 16; “Cisco Competitor Arista Networks Scores With Hot IPO,” June
 4 6, 2014 Investor’s Business Daily, available at <http://news.investors.com/technology/060614-703708-arista-networks-ipo-pops.htm>; CSI-CLI-00355230 – CSI-CLI-00355245.) It is therefore
 5 reasonable, as both a factual and legal matter, to infer that a substantial portion of Arista’s sales of
 6 any infringing devices come at Cisco’s expense, in the form of lost market share and lost profits.
 7 See, e.g., *State Indus., Inc. v. Mor-Flo Indus., Inc.*, 883 F.2d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *Datascope
 8 Corp. v. SMEC, Inc.*, 879 F.2d 820, 826 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

9 No inference is required in this case, however. That Arista’s infringing sales take sales and
 10 profits from Cisco is supported by Arista’s own public statements and industry commentary. For
 11 example, Arista’s CEO Jayshree Ullal told one industry analyst that “her customers are in the
 12 process of picking up Arista gear in order to have two suppliers where in past they only had one --
 13 Cisco.” (See “Cisco Races Hard to Stay Even,” August 16, 2014 Barron’s, available at
 14 <http://online.barrons.com/articles/SB50001424053111904537004580085620347668144>.) The
 15 industry analyst who reported Ms. Ullal’s statement was even more explicit: “As I’ve stated in the
 16 past, money in Arista’s pocket is money out of Chambers’ pocket. Arista’s \$137.9 million in
 17 revenue was not far from the \$152 million decline in Cisco’s switch sales, implying, if not
 18 proving, a direct correlation between Arista’s beat and Cisco’s slip in switching.” (See “Cisco
 19 Races Hard to Stay Even,” August 16, 2014 Barron’s, available at
 20 <http://online.barrons.com/articles/SB50001424053111904537004580085620347668144>.) And
 21 Arista publicly reports the correlation between its market share gains to Cisco’s market share
 22 losses. (See, e.g., CSI-CLI-00358000 – CSI-CLI-00358022; CSI-CLI-00355164 – CSI-CLI-
 23 00355185.)

24 Arista specifically emphasizes the similarity between its infringing CLI and Cisco’s
 25 patented and copyrighted CLI to promote sales of its infringing products—at Cisco’s expense.
 26
 27
 28

1 Exemplary comments demonstrating Arista's use of its infringing CLI to try to take Cisco's
 2 customers include the following:

- 3 • “[A] Cisco CCIE expert would be able to use Arista right away, because we have a
 4 similar command-line interface and operational look and feel. Where we don't
 5 have to invent, we don't.” John Gallant, “How Arista Networks Got Out In Front
 6 of the SDN Craze,” Network World (Feb. 22, 2013).
- 7 • Arista has learned to “[p]rovide familiar interfaces to ease adoption” including a
 8 “standard CLI that … retains familiar management commands” so much so that
 9 “80% [of Arista customers] tell us they appreciate the way they can leverage their
 10 deep [Cisco] IOS experience, as they can easily upgrade an aging [Cisco] Catalyst
 11 infrastructure to Arista.” Posting of Kenneth Duda to Arista EOS Central, “Linux
 12 as a Switch Operating System: Five Lessons Learned” (Nov. 5, 2013), *available at*
 13 <https://eos.arista.com/linux-as-a-switch-operating-system-five-lessons-learned/>.
- 14 • “Familiar management interfaces, standard CLI … It's been very helpful for our
 15 customers to be able to rapidly adopt our products and integrate them into their
 16 environments … that our switches provide a familiar management interface so their
 17 existing tools and processes, screen scraping, automation, continue to work just as
 18 they did before.” Arista, *EOS Bites & Bytes - Episode 1 - Lessons Learned While*
 19 *Building a Network OS on Top of Linux*, Arista EOS Central - Video Library (Jan.
 20 30, 2014), at 6:55–7:56, *available at* <http://eos.arista.com/wp-content/themes/aristaeos/video-lightbox.php?vid=ttpp6lavHKGo>.
- 21 • “The familiar EOS command-line interface (CLI) avoids retraining costs.” Arista,
 22 *EOS: An Extensible Operating System*.

23 At present, Arista has not produced sufficient information regarding its sales or customers
 24 for Cisco to identify specific sales lost to Arista, or to quantify Cisco's resulting lost profits more
 25 precisely. Pursuant to the agreement of the parties, such information will be exchanged at the end
 26 of August.

1 Individuals with knowledge of specific sales taken from Cisco by Arista are likely to
2 include members of Cisco's and Arista's sales and marketing teams. Arista's customers are also
3 likely to possess relevant information. Documents relevant to Arista's efforts to take sales from
4 Cisco are likely to include at least Arista's product documentation for its accused products and
5 marketing collateral related thereto.

6 Cisco further responds, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(d), that Cisco has produced
7 documents containing information responsive to this interrogatory, which information may be
8 obtained from the documents by Arista as easily as by Cisco. These documents include the
9 following: CSI-CLI-00355137 – CSI-CLI-00355138; CSI-CLI-00356774 – CSI-CLI-00356785;
10 CSI-CLI-00356786 – CSI-CLI-00356793; CSI-CLI-00356794 – CSI-CLI-00356801; CSI-CLI-
11 00356802 – CSI-CLI-00356809; CSI-CLI-00356810 – CSI-CLI-00356817; CSI-CLI-00356818 –
12 CSI-CLI-00356826; CSI-CLI-00356827 – CSI-CLI-00356835; CSI-CLI-00356836 – CSI-CLI-
13 00356841; CSI-CLI-00356848 – CSI-CLI-00356854; CSI-CLI-0000356855 - CSI-CLI-00356859;
14 CSI-CLI-00357765; CSI-CLI-00357842 – CSI-CLI-00357855.

15 Cisco's investigation of the subject matter of this interrogatory is ongoing. Cisco therefore
16 reserves the right to supplement this response as additional information becomes available.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 DATED: July 24, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

2 /s/ Sean S. Pak
3

4 Kathleen Sullivan (SBN 242261)
5 kathleensullivan@quinnmanuel.com
6 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
7 SULLIVAN LLP
8 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
9 New York, NY 10010
10 Telephone: (212) 849-7000
11 Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

12 Sean S. Pak (SBN 219032)
13 seancp@quinnmanuel.com
14 John M. Neukom (SBN 275887)
15 johnneukom@quinnmanuel.com.
16 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
17 SULLIVAN LLP
18 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
19 San Francisco, CA 94111
20 Telephone: (415) 875-6600
21 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

22 Mark Tung (SBN 245782)
23 marktung@quinnmanuel.com
24 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
25 SULLIVAN LLP
26 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
27 Redwood Shores, CA 94065
28 Telephone: (650) 801-5000
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

29 Steven Cherny (admitted *pro hac vice*)
30 steven.cherny@kirkland.com
31 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
32 601 Lexington Avenue
33 New York, New York 10022
34 Telephone: (212) 446-4800
35 Facsimile: (212) 446-4900

36 Adam R. Alper (SBN 196834)
37 adam.alper@kirkland.com
38 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
39 555 California Street
40 San Francisco, California 94104
41 Telephone: (415) 439-1400
42 Facsimile: (415) 439-1500

43 Michael W. De Vries (SBN 211001)
44 michael.devries@kirkland.com
45 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
46 333 South Hope Street
47 Los Angeles, California 90071

1 Telephone: (213) 680-8400
2 Facsimile: (213) 680-8500

3 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Cisco Systems, Inc.*

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

2 I hereby certify that, at the date entered below, I caused a true and correct copy of the
3 foregoing to be served by transmission via the email addresses below:

4 Juanita R. Brooks
5 brooks@fr.com
6 Fish & Richardson P.C.
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, CA 92130-2081

Brian L. Ferrall
blf@kvn.com
Michael S. Kwun
mkwun@kvn.com
David J. Silbert
djs@kvn.com
Robert Van Nest
rvannest@kvn.com
Keker & Van Nest LLP
633 Battery Street
San Francisco, CA 94111-1809

11 Ruffin B. Cordell
12 cordell@fr.com
13 Lauren A. Degnan
14 degnan@fr.com
15 Michael J. McKeon
16 mckeon@fr.com
17 Fish & Richardson PC
18 1425 K Street NW
19 11th Floor
20 Washington, DC 20005

18 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on July
19 24, 2015, at Berkeley, California.

/s/ Matthew D. Cannon

Matthew D. Cannon